UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. CONFIRMATION NO.		
10/776,265	02/12/2004	Atsushi Suda	826.1920	5496		
21171 STAAS & HA	7590 03/21/2007	EXAMINER				
SUITE 700		LEE, DA	LEE, DAVID J			
WASHINGTO	ORK AVENUE, N.W. ON. DC 20005		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
	,		2613			
SHORTENED STATUTOR	RY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVER	DELIVERY MODE		
3 MC	NTHS	03/21/2007	PAP	PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

			•		51			
		Application	No.	Applicant(s)				
Office Action Summary		10/776,265	·	SUDA ET AL.				
		Examiner		Art Unit				
		David Lee		2613				
Period fe	The MAILING DATE of this communication apport	pears on the c	over sheet with the c	orrespondence addres	ss			
WHIC - Exte after - If NC - Failt Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING D nsions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. O period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period are to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailin ed patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS 136(a). In no event will apply and will e b. cause the applica	S COMMUNICATION I, however, may a reply be time expire SIX (6) MONTHS from ation to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this commu D (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status				•				
1)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 F	ebruary 2004	<u>!</u> .					
2a)	This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠ This action is non-final.							
3)[☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is							
	closed in accordance with the practice under the	Ex parte Qua	yle, 1935 C.D. 11, 45	53 O.G. 213.				
Disposit	ion of Claims							
4)⊠	Claim(s) 1-14 is/are pending in the application	١.						
	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdra	wn from cons	sideration.					
5)	Claim(s) is/are allowed.				•			
	Claim(s) <u>1-14</u> is/are rejected.							
•	Claim(s) is/are objected to.		•		+			
8)[_]	Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	or election red	juirement.					
Applicat	ion Papers							
9)□	The specification is objected to by the Examine	er.		•				
10)⊠	The drawing(s) filed on 14 February 2004 is/ar							
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the							
11)	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct The oath or declaration is objected to by the E							
Priority	under 35 U.S.C. § 119							
-	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign ⊠ All b) Some * c) None of:	n priority unde	er 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).				
	1. Certified copies of the priority document	ts have been	received.					
	2. Certified copies of the priority documen							
	3. Copies of the certified copies of the price			ed in this National Sta	ige .			
*	application from the International Burea	•						
· ,	See the attached detailed Office action for a list	t of the certific	ed copies not receive	;u.				
Attachme	nt(s)							
	ce of References Cited (PTO-892)	•	4) Interview Summary	(PTO-413)				
	ce of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)	,	Paper No(s)/Mail D Notice of Informal F					
	er No(s)/Mail Date <u>2/14/04</u> .	•	6) Other:					

Application/Control Number: 10/776,265

Art Unit: 2613

DETAILED ACTION

Drawings

1. Figures 1-4 should be designated by a legend such as --Prior Art-- because only that which is old is illustrated. See MPEP § 608.02(g). Corrected drawings in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The replacement sheet(s) should be labeled "Replacement Sheet" in the page header (as per 37 CFR 1.84(c)) so as not to obstruct any portion of the drawing figures. If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

- 2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:
 - The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.
- 3. Claims 1-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.
- Claims 1, 3, 7, 8, 10, and 14 recite the limitation "the static characteristic." There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claims 4 and 11 recite the limitation "said comparison unit compares an untoothed waveform obtained by removing alternate pulses from a signal with a frequency twice as much as that of the signal with the low frequency, with a waveform with a frequency component twice

Application/Control Number: 10/776,265 Page 3

Art Unit: 2613

as much as that of the signal with the low frequency." It is unclear what is meant by "untoothed" waveform.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- 5. Claims 1-5, 7-12, and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Nakamoto et al. (US Patent No. 6,317,249 B1).

Regarding claims 1 and 8, as it is best understood in view of the 112 rejection above,
Nakamoto teaches an optical modulator having a function to compensate for the change of the
static characteristic of an external modulator (fig. 2; Abstract), comprising: a superimposition
unit superimposing a signal with a low frequency on an optical signal outputted by the external
modulator (superimposing circuit 3 of fig. 2 superimposes low frequency signal from low
frequency oscillator 8, outputted by external modulator 4); an extraction unit extracting a
component of an optical signal corresponding to the superimposed signal (light receiving
element 6 of fig. 2 extracts the superimposed signal); a comparison unit comparing the extracted
signal with the signal with the low frequency (synchronous detecting circuit 73 of fig. 2
compares the extracted signal with low frequency signal from oscillator 8); and a change unit
changing an amplitude of a driving signal to be supplied to the external modulator, based on an
output of the comparison unit (the amplitude of the signal is amplified via amplifiers 102 and

Application/Control Number: 10/776,265

Art Unit: 2613

104 based on the output of synchronous detecting circuit 73).

Regarding claims 2 and 9, Nakamoto teaches that the comparison unit outputs a result of adding a voltage of the extracted signal to a voltage of the signal with the low frequency (see e.g., col. 3, lines 40-44).

Regarding claims 3 and 10, as it is best understood in view of the 112 rejection above,

Nakamoto teaches that the comparison unit detects cases where an amplitude of the driving

signal is larger and smaller than the static characteristic of the external modulator using as

reference a comparison value in a case that the static characteristic of the external modulator and
an amplitude of the driving signal coincide (see e.g., col. 3, line 53 to col. 4, line 4).

Regarding claims 4 and 11, as it is best understood in view of the 112 rejection above, Nakamoto teaches that the comparison unit compares an untoothed waveform obtained by removing alternate pulses from a signal with a frequency twice as much as that of the signal with the low frequency, with a waveform with a frequency component twice as much as that of the signal with the low frequency (see e.g., fig. 5; see also col. 4, lines 29-44).

Regarding claims 5 and 12, Nakamoto teaches that said superimposition unit superimposes a signal with the low frequency on an optical output of the external modulator by applying a signal voltage with the low frequency to a driving electrode of the external modulator (superimposing circuit 3 of fig. 2 applies signal voltage from low frequency oscillator 8).

Regarding claims 7 and 14, as it is best understood in view of the 112 rejection above, Nakamoto teaches an optical modulator having a function to compensate for the change of the static characteristic of an external modulator (see fig. 2 and Abstract), comprising: a superimposition unit superimposing signals each with a first or second low frequency on an

optical signal outputted by the external modulator (superimposing circuit 3 of fig. 2 superimposes low frequency signal from low frequency oscillator 8, outputted by external modulator 4); an extraction unit extracting a component of an optical signal corresponding to the superimposed signal (light receiving element 6 of fig. 2 extracts the superimposed signal); a comparison unit comparing the extracted signal and signals with the first and the second low frequency (synchronous detecting circuit 73 of fig. 2 compares the extracted signal with low frequency signal from oscillator 8; note also that comparator 103 of fig. 2 compares a first and second low frequency signal); an amplitude changing unit changing an amplitude of a driving signal to be supplied to the external modulator, based on an output of the comparison unit (note amplifiers 102 and 104 and bias control circuit 9 of fig. 2); and a voltage changing unit changing an operating point voltage to be supplied to the external modulator based on the output of the comparison unit (bias control unit 9 of fig. 2 changes an operating point voltage based on the output; see also col. 3, lines 36-49).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 7. Claims 6 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nakamoto in view of Aoki (US Patent No. 5,315,426).

Application/Control Number: 10/776,265

Art Unit: 2613

Regarding claims 6 and 13, as it is best understood in view of the 112 rejection above, Nakamoto does not expressly teach that superimposition unit superimposes a signal with the low frequency on an optical output of the external modulator by directly controlling a light source supplying the external modulator with light. However, directly controlling a light source rather than a modulator itself is well known in the art. For example, Aoki, from a similar field of endeavor, teaches an optical modulator having a function to compensate for the change of a static characteristic of an external modulator (see fig. 2 and Abstract) comprising a superimposition unit which superimposes a signal with the low frequency on an optical output of the external modulator by directly controlling a light source supplying the external modulator with light (see transmitter 1 of fig. 2: the light is directly controlled by the superimposition signal). It would have been obvious to a skilled artisan at the time of invention to directly control the light source as taught by Nakamoto in order to decrease on component costs.

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to David Lee whose telephone number is (571) 272-2220. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jason Chan can be reached on (571) 272-3022. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 10/776,265 Page 7

Art Unit: 2613

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

David Lee

Patent Examiner

JASON CHAN
JASON CHAN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600